



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to show,' as is shown by the phrase "the wyne moste be payede fore."¹²

Since I have necessarily devoted most of my space to a discussion of the weaknesses of Professor Gollancz's edition, I may inadvertently have given the impression that the number of these weaknesses is relatively large. But this is by no means the case. This edition of *Winnere and Wastoure*, though it is marred by a poor text and by occasional dogmatic and too-ingenuous statements, constitutes, because of the excellence of its preface, notes, and glossary, a valuable contribution to the study of *Winnere and Wastoure* and other Middle English alliterative poems. It is a book that will amply repay the careful examination of every student of Middle English literature.

J. M. STEADMAN, JR.

Emory University, Atlanta.

The Use of TU and VOUS in Molière. By P. B. FAY. University of California Publications, 1920, Vol. VIII, No. 3, pp. 227-286.

In this monograph the author proposes "to examine in detail the use of *tu* and *vous* in Molière's plays, to determine, as accurately as possible, the field which belongs to each, and especially to try to explain the psychological or stylistic reasons which underlie the rather frequent changes from *vous* to *tu* and the reverse."

Several methods of presentation are suggested. The author has chosen the one used by Schliebitz in *Die Person der Anrede in der französischen Sprache* (Breslau, 1886). He classifies his material according to the relation between the speaker and the person addressed. He finds that in the upper and middle classes the polite form is used between husband and wife except in three cases. Fathers, in addressing their children, seldom use either form to the exclusion of the other. When mothers address their children,

¹² Gollancz in his note to this line remarks: "*Fore*: probably added by the scribe." But doesn't *fore* mean 'for'? *Pay for(e)* is a common phrase. In line 477 Gollancz prints *tonne* for the MS. *tauerne*. His note in explanation of *tonne*, which he regards as the name of some particular tavern, is rendered unnecessary by a reference to the MS. The notes to lines 108, 236, 290-294 are also unconvincing. In the notes to lines 286 and 407 misprints occur.

brothers and sisters one another, or uncles and aunts their nephews and nieces, the form, as we should expect, is *vous*. Between those of higher station and servants, between servants themselves, the form is *tu*, which is perfectly natural. In short, one might summarize, using the author's own phrases as criteria, by saying that when Molière's characters wish to be abusive or to express affection, anger, scorn, familiarity, a confidential attitude, the *tu* form is usual; for irony, indignant surprise, parental authority, reproach, severity, formality, *vous* is the form generally used.

If we are to draw any definite conclusions as to Molière's usage of the pronouns of address, our information must be more definite and more extended than what is presented here. The author fails to make his study sufficiently statistical. He does not show clearly enough the evidence on which he bases his deductions as to what pronoun is the normal form of address in a particular play. If he is either to sustain or to disprove the theory of Schliebitz, who says (page 41) that with *l'Avare* (1668) there is between parents and children a shift from *tu* as the normal, unemotional form to *vous*, he should give us the evidence and not deal in generalities. The result of this non-scientific approach is that the phrasing of his article is at times vague. "It is true," he says (page 237, note 16), "that the facts do to a certain extent seem to point in this direction [that is, to a change in usage after *l'Avare*], but there are so many exceptions. . . ." We should like to know definitely how many cases and how many exceptions there are so as to be able to weigh more accurately the evidence. Again: "The causes underlying these changes [that is, from *tu* to *vous* between fathers and sons or daughters] may in most cases, though not always, be readily inferred," than which there is nothing more vague or unscientific. And once more: "But it is possible, I believe, to discern certain general tendencies to which many of the cases appear to conform." He should have presented the actual statistics, showing the general tendency and the exceptional cases.

His interpretations are in general correct, though in one instance he seems to have gone far afield. In this case (p. 243) he offers the irritation caused by Dorine's repeated interruptions as explanation for the shift from *vous* to *tu* when Mariane is addressed by her father. The shift would seem rather to be due to a more familiar, persuasive, or wheedling attitude on the part of her father.

Our author says himself that there are not "startling general conclusions in regard to Molière's use of *tu* and *vous*." He has neither proved nor disproved the statement of Schliebitz and has added very little incidental information to our knowledge of Molière's usage. A better method would be to study the psychology of individual cases, treat the plays chronologically, and submit the numerical evidence of the use of *tu* and *vous*. Basing the study on such factors is the only way to show the truth or falsity of Schliebitz's theory and hence to discover if there is any change from contemporary usage in Molière's plays. This still remains to be done.

EDWARD H. SIRICH.

University of Minnesota.

Anthony Aston, Stroller and Adventurer, by WATSON NICHOLSON, Ph. D. Published by the Author. South Haven, Michigan, 1920. 98 pp.

Dr. Nicholson's book concerns itself with one of the lesser figures of the eighteenth century stage, who has hitherto, even to most close students of the period, been scarcely more than a name. But the real interest and significance that are seen to adhere to the unconventional person of Anthony Aston fully justify this small volume, in which is assembled all the available material on that engaging farceur and soldier of fortune.

The main basis of the biographical study, which occupies the first half of the brochure, is the extremely rare "Sketch of the Life, &c. of Mr. Anthony Aston, Commonly call'd Tony Aston. Written by Himself," which Dr. Nicholson, in 1914, came upon in the British Museum appended to *The Fool's Opera*, a slender dramatic piece by Aston, written under the pseudonym of Mat. Medley.

Unfortunately Dr. Nicholson's elation over his find betrayed him into grave indiscretion. He says (p. 7) "It appeared in no library catalogue that I had ever seen," and later (p. 42) "The British Museum probably possesses the only copy in existence. It is the only authoritative account of the life of Anthony Aston thus far unearthed, and its existence was not suspected until I discovered it a few years ago."